

PATENT
09/627,223

Remarks

The Abstract has been amended to conform to Abstract requirement pointed out by Examiner.

It is respectfully requested that the Double Patenting rejection be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is determined in the present application, at which time Applicants are prepared to file an appropriate timely disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Applicants' attorney thanks Examiner for the telephone interview granted on April 8, 2004. As a result of clarifications made during the interview, the claims have been amended to distinguish between requested and actually received hypertext Web documents, and also to maintain consistent antecedent relationships between elements in the claims.

As it has turned out, the above described amendments have, in addition to overcoming the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, also served to further distinguish the amended claims from the newly cited Narayanaswami (US6,182,113) reference. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13-16 and 20-24, as amended, are not anticipated by Narayanaswami under 35 USC 102(e).

As Applicants pointed out during the interview, they do not claim to be the first to recognize that there may be circumstances when the Web documents may be transmitted and presented in a text only mode. That is essentially all that the Narayanaswami teaching has in common with present invention.

The present invention goes on to provide an implementation by which the user is enabled to preselect those Web documents which when subsequently received will be downloaded in a text-only mode. A convenient application of

AUS920000273US1

11

PATENT
09/627,223

this function would be the bookmarked Web document. When a Web document is bookmarked, the user has already previously viewed and may thus evaluate and preselect the state of any subsequent download of the Web document. Similarly, a familiar user may be aware of Web sites and even Web domains which conventionally provide complex Web documents with elaborate graphics and images. Thus, documents from such sources may be preselected for the text-only download mode. The key to the present invention is that although the requested Web documents are hypertext documents and are transmitted from their Web sources as single not multiple hypertext documents, which include graphics, they may be selectively downloaded at the receiving terminals in a text-only mode or in the default graphics and text mode.

As Figs. 2, 3A and 3B in Narayanaswami show, the Web pages i.e. Web documents are transmitted from the source as two different pages: one including graphics and one with text-only (Fig. 3A first Web page is "WS A INCLUDE GRAPHICS", and second Web page is "WS A TEXT ONLY").

Unlike the above reference, in the present invention, a process is set up at the receiving station for storing a listing of such preselected documents or document domains which are to be displayed in a text-only mode and comparing received Web documents to the stored list. The same hypertext Web document is downloaded and displayed in a text-only mode if there is a compare to such a stored document or domain designation.

Claims 2, 9, and 16 are further defined as having a bookmark for the requested Web document which indicates whether the document when received is to be downloaded in a text-only mode. Narayanaswami, to the contrary treats the text-only Web document as a separate Web document from the

AUS920000273US1

12

PATENT
09/627,223

full graphics Web document, and assigns to each a separate bookmark.

Claims 7, 14, and 21 may be further distinguished from the Narayanaswami reference in that they claim the storing of a list at the receiving display station defining which Web documents when received are to be downloaded and displayed in a text-only mode. The teaching of Narayanaswami would lead away from such an embodiment in that the Web documents of Narayanaswami are already in the text-only format when received, and, thus, would not require any comparison to such a stored list.

New claims 22-24 further set forth that the text-only mode in which the preselected received Web documents are downloaded and displayed is an ASCII mode. There is no mention of ASCII downloading in Narayanaswami.

The rejection of claims 3-5, 10-12, and 17-19 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Narayanaswami in view of Duval et al. (US5,884,033) is also respectfully traversed.

These claims cover the additional aspect of the present invention of preselecting domains from which Web documents are to be downloaded and displayed in a text-only mode. The Examiner admits that Narayanaswami does not disclose this and relies on Duvall to make up for this deficiency in Narayanaswami.

It is submitted that about the only thing that Duvall has in common with either the present invention or Narayanaswami is that all relate to transmission of Web documents. Duvall is no way concerned with problems with bandwidth or downloading times of Web documents. Duvall is primarily concerned with the filtering out of objectionable content, particularly sexually explicit content from Web documents so that children may be protected. This is rather

AUS920000273US1

13

PATENT
09/627,223


remote from Web document bandwidth or downloading time optimization. It would appear that Examiner is prompted to contend that the Duvall patent pornographic filtering to be an art analogous to Applicants' preselected downloading mode because Duvall predesignates specific known pornographic Web sites as those whose Web documents are to be filtered for sexual content, and the present invention preselects documents from selected sites for a text-only download.

Applicants submit that Narayanaswami does not consider the web site or the source of their Web documents for any purpose. Thus the only suggestion that Duvall would be selected by such criteria would come only from the present invention. Combinations of references can not be made based upon applicants' own teaching.

Thus, if we would look to the teachings of the two references alone why would one skilled in the art be led to combine disclosures from the technology of filtering Web documents for sexual content with disclosures from optimizing Web download capacities?

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-24 are submitted to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested

Respectfully submitted

 4/17/04
J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758

AUS920000273US1

14